REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-14, 17, 18, 20-22 and 25 have been amended herewith. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-21 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hunnicutt et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,889,952. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the cache comprises an inheritance portion and a direct portion, as depicted in Figure 3. By organizing the cache in such fashion, it is possible to implement different caching methodologies for each cache portion, and the authorization cache manager may be tuned for population size characteristics (Specification page 12, lines 11-16). The cited reference does not teach this claimed feature or its resulting advantages. Therefore, the amendment to Claim 1 has overcome the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 2-9 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claims 2-9 depend upon).

Further with respect to Claim 2, such claim has been amended to recite that the cache comprises both a grant field and a deny field, as shown by the structure on page 13, lines 5 and 6, thereby advantageously providing a finer granularity with respect to the overall authorization cache management functionality. The cited reference does not teach both a grant and a deny field, and thus the amendment to Claim 2 is further shown to have overcome the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

Further with respect to Claim 3, such claim has been amended to more clearly recite that the one or more predetermined parameters used by the first software to authorize or deny the use of the resource is an identifier of the requesting resource, as described at Specification page 13, lines 8, 11-13 and 21-22, thereby advantageously allowing for application-based policies to be applied with respect to the requested resource. The cited reference does not teach this claimed feature or its resulting

advantages. Therefore, the amendment to Claim 3 further overcomes the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

Further with respect to Claim 6, such claim has been amended to recite that the key used in searching the cache is derived from hashing one or more of the search parameters, thereby further improving overall system performance (Specification page 12, lines 17-21). The cited reference does not teach this claimed feature or its resulting advantages. Therefore, the amendment to Claim 6 further overcomes the 35 USC 102(b) rejection. In addition, because the teachings of the cited reference teach both a user-token cache and an access-cache, where a unique user-token is assigned to a user and stored in the user-token cache, for subsequent use when accessing the access-cache (col. 4, lines 5-21 and 60-63; col. 5, lines 27-29), there would have been no motivation to modify the teachings contained therein in accordance with the hashing technique of Claim 6, as the two systems are not compatible with one another. For example, Hunnicutt uses a username to index into a file for a token, and this token is itself subsequently used as an index into the access-cache. It is thus further urged that Claim 6 would not have been obvious in view of the cited reference.

Further with respect to Claim 9, such claim has been amended to describe how the inherited and direct cache portions (as recited in Claim 1) are utilized when creating a cache entry, as shown in Figure 8, blocks 110, 114 and 116 and described at Specification page 16, lines 13-15. The cited reference does not teach this claimed feature. Therefore, the amendment to Claim 9 further overcomes the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

With respect to Claim 10 (and dependent Claims 11-17), such claim has been amended to recite particulars with respect to the use of hashing techniques to improve performance associated with cache access and look-up. For similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 6, the cited reference does not teach this claimed feature or its resulting advantages. Therefore, the amendment to Claim 10 overcomes the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

Further with respect to Claim 11, Applicants further traverse for similar reasons to the further reasons given above with respect to Claim 2.

Further with respect to Claim 12, such claim has been amended to recite that one of the predetermined parameters that is used in determining resource authorization is an

expire time of when a given cache entry expires, as shown at Specification page 13, line 8 and 10-11, thereby allowing for conformance to time-based policies that a particular resource may require. The cited reference does not teach this claimed feature or its resulting advantages. Therefore, the amendment to Claim 12 further overcomes the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

Further with respect to Claim 13, Applicants further traverse for similar reasons to the further reasons given above with respect to Claim 3.

Further with respect to Claim 14, Applicants further traverse for similar reasons to the further reasons given above with respect to Claim 12.

Further with respect to Claim 17, Applicants further traverse for similar reasons to the further reasons given above with respect to Claim 9.

With respect to Claim 18 (and dependent Claims 19-25), Applicants have amended such claim to recite that the authorization request comprises an identifier of an application that generated the authorization request, as described at Specification page 13, lines 8, 11-13 and 21-22. This claimed feature advantageously allows for application-based policies to be applied with respect to the requested resource. The cited reference does not teach this claimed feature or its resulting advantages. Therefore, the amendment to Claim 18 overcomes the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

Further with respect to Claim 20, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 3.

Further with respect to Claim 21, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

Further with respect to Claim 25, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 9.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-21 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been overcome.

II. **35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

The Examiner rejected Claims 5, 14 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hunnicutt et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,889,952, and further in view of Garg et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/0002577 A1. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially with respect to Claims 5, 14 and 22, Applicants traverse for reasons given above with respect to independent Claims 1, 10 and 18, of which these claims respectively depend upon.

Further with respect to Claims 5, 14 and 22, Applicants urge that none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed feature that the time of day is with respect to the lifetime of a given cache entry. The cited Garg reference merely states that time of day may be used in evaluating access control decisions. In contrast, the amendment to Claims 5, 14 and 22 make it clear that the time is with respect to the lifetime of a cache entry itself, thereby advantageously allowing for restricting the life of an entry in the authorization cache to a time within the semantic limits of a given security policy (Specification page 13, lines 10-11). None of the cited references teach or suggest this specific claimed feature or its resulting advantages. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 5, 14 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 7/25/05

Respectfully submitted,

Duke W. Yee
Reg. No. 34,285
Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorneys for Applicant